arXiv:1211.1626v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 7 Nov 2012

DRIFT OF PHASE FLUCTUATIONS IN THE ABC MODEL

LORENZO BERTINI AND PAOLO BUTTÀ

Abstract. In a recent work, Bodineau and Derrida analyzed the phase fluctuations in the ABC model. In particular, they computed the asymptotic variance and, on the basis of numerical simulations, they conjectured the presence of a drift, which they guessed to be an antisymmetric function of the three densities. By assuming the validity of the fluctuating hydrodynamic approximation, we prove the presence of such a drift, providing an analytical expression for it. This expression is then shown to be an antisymmetric function of the three densities. The antisymmetry of the drift can also be inferred from a symmetry property of the underlying microscopic dynamics.

1. Introduction

The *ABC model*, introduced by Evans et al. [12, 13], is a one-dimensional stochastic conservative dynamics with local jump rates, whose invariant measure undergoes a phase transition. It is a system consisting of three species of particles, traditionally labeled A, B, and C, on a discrete ring with L sites. The system evolves by nearest neighbor particles exchanges with the following rates: $AB \to BA$, $BC \to CB$, $CA \to AC$ with rate q and $BA \to AB$, $CB \to BC$, $AC \to CA$ with rate $1/q$. In particular, the total number of particles N_α, of each species $\alpha \in \{A,B,C\}$, are conserved and satisfy $N_A+N_B+N_C = L$. When $q \neq 1$, Evans et al. [12, 13] argued that in the thermodynamic limit $L \to \infty$ with $N_\alpha/L \to r_\alpha$ the system segregates into pure A, B, and C regions, with translationally invariant distribution of the phase boundaries. In the equal densities case $N_A = N_B = N_C = L/3$ the dynamics is reversible and its invariant measure can be explicitly computed. As shown in [14, 15], the ABC model can be reformulated in terms of a dynamic of random walks on the triangular lattice.

As discussed by Clincy et al. [10], the natural scaling to investigate the asymptotic behavior of the ABC model is the *weakly asymmetric* regime $q = \exp\big\{-\frac{\beta}{2L}\big\}$, where the parameter β plays the role of an inverse temperature. With this choice, the reversible measure of the equal densities case $r_A = r_B = r_C = 1/3$ becomes a canonical Gibbs measure with a mean field Hamiltonian, which undergoes a second order phase transition at $\beta_{\mathrm{c}} = 2\pi\sqrt{3}$. More precisely, for $\beta \le \beta_{\mathrm{c}}$ the typical densities profiles are homogeneous while for $\beta > \beta_{\mathrm{c}}$ the three species segregate. For unequal densities the invariant measure of the ABC dynamics on a ring is not reversible and cannot be computed explicitly. The asymptotic of the two-point correlation functions in the homogeneous phase is obtained in [6, 10], where the large deviation rate function for the stationary measure is also calculated up to order β^2. When the ABC dynamics is considered on an open interval with zero flux condition

---

Key words and phrases. ABC Model, Phase fluctuations, Fluctuating hydrodynamics.

at the endpoints, the corresponding invariant measure is reversible for all values of the densities [1]. In particular, it has the same Gibbs form as the one in the ring for the equal density case. In this paper we shall however stick to the case of periodic boundary conditions.

In the diffusive scaling limit, the hydrodynamic behavior of the empirical densities $\rho = \rho(x,t) = \big(\rho_A(x,t), \rho_B(x,t), \rho_C(x,t)\big)$, where $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbf{T}$, the one-dimensional torus of length one, is given by the parabolic system,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho_A = \partial_{xx}\rho_A + \beta\,\partial_x\big[\rho_A(\rho_B - \rho_C)\big], \\ \partial_t \rho_B = \partial_{xx}\rho_B + \beta\,\partial_x\big[\rho_B(\rho_C - \rho_A)\big], \\ \partial_t \rho_C = \partial_{xx}\rho_C + \beta\,\partial_x\big[\rho_C(\rho_A - \rho_B)\big]. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

The initial conditions are determined by the starting microscopic configuration, they satisfy the constraints $\rho_A(\cdot,0) + \rho_B(\cdot,0) + \rho_C(\cdot,0) = 1$ and $0 \leq \rho_\alpha(\cdot,0) \leq 1$, $\alpha \in \{A,B,C\}$, which are preserved by the above flow. Clearly, it also preserves the total mass of each species, i.e., $r_\alpha = \int \mathrm{d}x\,\rho_\alpha(x,t)$, $\alpha \in \{A,B,C\}$, is constant in time. We mention that in the equal densities case, $r_A = r_B = r_C = 1/3$, the flow defined by (1.1) is a (suitable) *gradient flow* of the large deviations rate function, which in this case reads,

$$\mathcal{F}_\beta(\rho) = \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x \sum_\alpha \rho_\alpha(x)\log\rho_\alpha(x) + \beta\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x \int_x^1 \mathrm{d}y \sum_\alpha \rho_\alpha(x)\rho_{\alpha+2}(y), \tag{1.2}$$

where the sum on the species label α is modulo three. This is the macroscopic counterpart of the reversibility of the underlying microscopic dynamics.

In the equal density case the stationary solutions to (1.1) correspond to the critical points of (1.2), which have been analyzed in [1]. In particular, the homogenous profile $r = (\frac13, \frac13, \frac13)$ is the unique stationary solutions for $\beta \in [0, \beta_\mathrm{c}]$, while for $\beta > \beta_\mathrm{c}$ there exists a one-periodic inhomogeneus stationary solution, unique up to translations, which minimizes the large deviation functional and it is therefore stable for the flow (1.1). In the general case, the homogeneous profile $r = (r_A, r_B, r_C)$ is clearly still a stationary solution to (1.1). For β small enough (depending on r) it is the unique one. As discussed in [6, 10], a linear stability analysis shows that for $\beta > \beta_r = 2\pi/\sqrt{1-2r^2}$, $r^2 = r_A^2 + r_B^2 + r_C^2$, it becomes unstable. As stated there, the phase transition, at least for particular values of r, is expected to become of first order. Namely, for some $\beta \in (0, \beta_r)$ there exist other stationary solutions to (1.1) which actually describe the typical profiles with respect to the invariant measure of the underlying microscopic dynamics. In [11] the stationary solutions to (1.1) are characterized and their explicit expression is written in terms of elliptic functions. This analysis reveals that for some r and $\beta \in (0, \beta_r)$ there exist one-periodic stationary solutions to (1.1), in agreement with the conjectured occurrence of a first order transition.

The next natural issue on (1.1) is whether it admits traveling wave solutions, this is indeed a side question both in [5] and [11]. A simple argument, discussed in [20] shows that such solutions do not occur. For the reader's convenience we report the argument in Appendix A. We emphasize that the periodicity of the space variable is crucial. Indeed, when the system (1.1) is considered on the whole line it does admit traveling waves.

The main result of the present paper is the identification of the drift for the phase fluctuations. In order to describe it, fix values of r and β in the low temperature part of the phase diagram. The analysis in [11] implies the existence of a one-periodic profile $\bar\rho = \big(\bar\rho_A, \bar\rho_B, \bar\rho_C\big)$ such that the one-periodic stationary solutions to (1.1) are given by the translations of $\bar\rho$. Observe that, as discussed in [1, 11], for larger values of β there exist also $\frac{1}{2}$-periodic solutions, $\frac{1}{3}$-periodic solutions,... However, as proven in [1] in the case of equal densities and suggested by numerical evidences in general, these less segregated profiles are not expected to describe the typical behavior of the microscopic evolution. Consider now the microscopic dynamics in which the initial distribution of the species is associated to the macroscopic profile $\bar\rho$. The hydrodynamical description discussed above implies that on the microscopic time scale $O(L^2)$ the associated macroscopic profile does not move. Since macroscopic fluctuations are $O(L^{-\frac{1}{2}})$, by taking into account the translation invariance, at times $O(L^3)$ the macroscopic profile is expected to perform a random motion on the set $\big\{\bar\rho(\cdot - z),\, z \in \mathbf{T}\big\}$. This motion is refereed to as *phase fluctuations*. In agreement with the above dynamical picture, we observe that in the equal densities case, by sampling the particles according to the Gibbsian invariant measure, the law of large numbers for the empirical densities of the three species is $\bar\rho(\cdot - \zeta)$, where ζ is a uniform random variable on $\mathbf{T}$, see [2] for a formal proof of this statement.

Bodineau and Derrida [5] have computed the variance of the phase fluctuations by using both the methods of the fluctuating hydrodynamics and of the macroscopic fluctuation theory. Moreover, on the basis of numerical evidences, further confirmed in [11], they conjectured the presence of a drift which they guessed to be an antisymmetric function of the three densities. Observe that for equal densities, reversibility readily implies that the drift vanishes. In this paper, by assuming the validity of the fluctuating hydrodynamic approximation for the ABC model, we prove in general the presence of such a drift, provide an analytical expression for it, and show its expected antisymmetry property. We also show that this antisymmetry can be inferred from a general symmetry of the underlying microscopic dynamics.

In order to obtain the statistics of the phase fluctuations, we need to obtain an effective dynamics on the manifold $\big\{\bar\rho(\cdot{-}z),\, z \in \mathbf{T}\big\}$. The fluctuating hydrodynamic approximation allows to describe the behavior of the microscopic ABC dynamics by the hydrodynamic equations (1.1) perturbed with an additive noise of order $L^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. In particular, the behavior of the ABC model on time scale $O(L^3)$ is captured by the asymptotics of the fluctuating hydrodynamics on the time scale $O(L)$. Under this assumption, the variance of the phase fluctuations can be computed by considering the projection along the manifold of the noise: this is the sum of independent, mean zero, order $L^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ random variables, that converges to a Brownian motion. On the other hand, the origin of the drift is much less evident and due to the nonlinearity of (1.1). Indeed, we show that in a time step T with $1 \ll T \ll L$ the nonlinear term gives a deterministic contribution to the effective dynamics of order T/L, which sum up to a finite drift at times $O(L)$.

We finally mention that the statistics of dynamical phase fluctuations has been already analyzed in the context of the one-dimensional nonconservative stochastic Ginzburg-Landau equation [8, 9, 16]. In particular, if the reaction term is not symmetric, the mechanism outlined above gives rise to a constant drift in the resulting random motion. This has been rigorously proved in [7]. Phase fluctuations for the Kuramoto model, which is a mean field conservative dynamics, have been recently discussed in [4].

2. Identification of the drift

In this section we introduce the fluctuating hydrodynamic assumption and identify the drift of the phase fluctuations in terms of the semigroup generated by the linearization of (1.1) around the periodic profiles $\bar{\rho}$. We shall frequently refer to [5] and use the same notation introduced there. For convenience we set $\varepsilon = 1/L$.

The fluctuating hydrodynamic assumption. At the macroscopic level, the effect of the microscopic fluctuation can be modeled by adding to the hydrodynamic system (1.1) a suitable random force whose statistics can be inferred by an informal computation on the underlying Markov dynamics. Referring to either Appendix B or [5, 6, 10] for the details of such computation, the corresponding stochastic system reads, using vector notation and denoting partial derivatives with subscripts,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \rho_A \\ \rho_B \\ \rho_C \end{pmatrix}_t = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_A \\ \rho_B \\ \rho_C \end{pmatrix}_{xx} + \beta \begin{pmatrix} \rho_A(\rho_B - \rho_C) \\ \rho_B(\rho_C - \rho_A) \\ \rho_C(\rho_A - \rho_B) \end{pmatrix}_x + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \begin{pmatrix} \eta^\varepsilon_A \\ \eta^\varepsilon_B \\ \eta^\varepsilon_C \end{pmatrix}_x \tag{2.1}$$

where $t \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}$, the one-dimensional torus, and, conditionally on the value ρ, the noise $\eta^\varepsilon = (\eta^\varepsilon_A, \eta^\varepsilon_B, \eta^\varepsilon_C)$ is Gaussian with correlations

$$\left\langle \eta^\varepsilon_\alpha(x,t)\eta^\varepsilon_{\alpha'}(x',t') \right\rangle = \Sigma_{\alpha,\alpha'}(\rho; x, x')\, \delta_\varepsilon(x-x')\, \delta(t-t'), \qquad \alpha, \alpha' \in \{A, B, C\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Above, δ_ε is the ε-approximation to the Dirac's δ-function, i.e., its length scale is of order ε, and Σ is the matrix

$$\Sigma(\rho; x, x') = D(\rho; x, x') + D(\rho; x', x) \tag{2.3}$$

in which $D(\rho; x, x')$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} \rho_A(x)[\rho_B(x') + \rho_C(x')] & -\rho_A(x)\rho_B(x') & -\rho_A(x)\rho_C(x') \\ -\rho_A(x)\rho_B(x') & \rho_B(x)[\rho_A(x') + \rho_C(x')] & -\rho_B(x)\rho_C(x') \\ -\rho_A(x)\rho_C(x') & -\rho_B(x)\rho_C(x') & \rho_C(x)[\rho_A(x') + \rho_B(x')] \end{pmatrix}.$$

Observe that Σ has a vanishing eingenvalue with corresponding eigenspace spanned by the vector $(1, 1, 1)^\top$. Accordingly, (2.1) preserves the constraint $\sum_\alpha \rho_\alpha = 1$.

Clearly, the (deterministic) hydrodynamic system (1.1) is recovered from (2.1) simply by setting $\varepsilon = 0$. As discussed e.g., in [21, § II.3.5], (2.1) also predicts the nonequilibrium Gaussian fluctuation which can be inferred by linearizing (2.1) around an hydrodynamic solution. As discussed in the Introduction, in our analysis we shall need the stronger assumption that (2.1) correctly encodes the behavior of the ABC dynamics on time scales longer then the hydrodynamical one. More precisely, as phase fluctuations becomes observable (i.e., macroscopically of order one) at microscopic times of order L^3, the connection between the analysis on the stochastic system (2.1) performed in the sequel and the microscopic dynamics relies on the hypotheses that the ABC dynamics at times L^3 can be captured by looking at (2.1) on times of order ε^{-1} and then taking the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$.

In regard to the fluctuating hydrodynamic assumption, we simply observe that the use of nonlinear stochastic equation to describe the evolution of particle systems beyond the hydrodynamic scale is a common practice in nonequilibrium statistical physics. On the other hand, the rigorous justification of such procedure is a most challenging task of mathematical physics, see [3] for the weakly asymmetric exclusion process which has, albeit much simpler, similar feature to the ABC model. We finally emphasize that in (2.1) we have somehow kept track of the underlying discrete structure by using a colored noise with spatial correlation length of order

ε. With this choice, we avoid in particular the difficult problem of giving a precise mathematical meaning to (2.1) with a space-time white noise, see [17] for the KPZ equation whose nonlinearity has a similar structure. As it will clear in the computation of the drift, the problem of ultraviolet singularities will however appear when taking the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$.

The effective phase dynamics. It is convenient to take advantage of the constraint $\rho_A + \rho_B + \rho_C = 1$ and write the system (2.1) in terms of

$$\rho = \rho(x,t) = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_A(x,t) \\ \rho_B(x,t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Denoting by

$$\mathcal{N}(\rho) = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_A^2 + 2\rho_A\rho_B - \rho_A \\ -\rho_B^2 - 2\rho_A\rho_B + \rho_B \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \eta^\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_A^\varepsilon \\ \eta_B^\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.4}$$

the nonlinear transport and the noise, respectively, we thus rewrite (2.1) as

$$\rho_t = \rho_{xx} + \beta \mathcal{N}(\rho)_x + \sqrt{\varepsilon}\, \eta_x^\varepsilon. \tag{2.5}$$

Conditionally on the value ρ, the noise η^ε is Gaussian with correlations as in (2.2), where $\Sigma(\rho; x, x')$ is the 2×2 matrix as in (2.3) in which now

$$D(\rho; x, x') = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_A(x)[1 - \rho_A(x')] & -\rho_A(x)\rho_B(x') \\ -\rho_A(x)\rho_B(x') & \rho_B(x)[1 - \rho_B(x')] \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.6}$$

Hereafter, we fix the total densities $r = (r_A, r_B)$ and $\beta > 0$ in the low temperature part of the phase diagram established in [11]. The analysis therein implies the existence of a one-periodic profile

$$\bar{\rho} = \bar{\rho}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\rho}_A(x) \\ \bar{\rho}_B(x) \end{pmatrix}$$

which solves the following system of ordinary differential equation,

$$\bar{\rho}'' + \beta \mathcal{N}(\bar{\rho})' = 0, \tag{2.7}$$

and satisfies the constraints $\bar{\rho}_\alpha \geq 0$, $\bar{\rho}_A + \bar{\rho}_B \leq 1$, and $\int \mathrm{d}x\, \bar{\rho}_\alpha = r_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \{A, B\}$. The one-periodic stationary solutions to (2.5) with $\varepsilon = 0$ are given by the translations of $\bar{\rho}$.

We denote by $\bar{\rho}_z(x) = \bar{\rho}(x - z)$ the translation of $\bar{\rho}$ by z on the torus. Let also $\mathcal{L}_z$ be the linear part of (2.5) around $\bar{\rho}_z$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_z \psi = \psi_{xx} + \beta(\mathcal{B}_z \psi)_x, \tag{2.8}$$

where

$$\mathcal{B}_z(x) = \mathcal{B}(x - z), \qquad \mathcal{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 2\bar{\rho}_A + 2\bar{\rho}_B - 1 & 2\bar{\rho}_A \\ -2\bar{\rho}_B & -2\bar{\rho}_A - 2\bar{\rho}_B + 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.9}$$

Recall [5] that

$$\chi_z(x) = \big(\bar{\rho}_B(x - z), -\bar{\rho}_A(x - z)\big), \qquad \bar{\rho}_z'(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\rho}_A'(x - z) \\ \bar{\rho}_B'(x - z) \end{pmatrix}$$

are the left and right eigenvectors of $\mathcal{L}_z$ with zero eigenvalue, which can be easily shown to be a simple eigenvalue. The rest of the spectrum is composed by a countable set of eigenvalues. As in [5], we assume they have strictly negative real part, bounded away from zero. In regard to this assumption, we remark that in the equal density case $\mathcal{L}_z$ can be realized as a nonnegative self-adjoint operator on a suitable Hilbert space and the above assumption is fulfilled. A standard perturbation argument implies that it also holds for r close to $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$. Under this assumption, the manifold $\mathcal{M} = \{\bar{\rho}_z : z \in \mathbf{T}\}$ is locally exponentially attractive for the deterministic flow (1.1). The (not orthogonal) projection onto the null space of $\mathcal{L}_z$ is given by the tensor product $\gamma \bar{\rho}'_z(x)\chi_z(x')$, where

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} = \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x \, \chi \, \bar{\rho}'. \tag{2.10}$$

We shall also denote by $\mathcal{P}_z$ the projector whose integral kernel is given by $\mathcal{P}_z(x, x') = \delta(x - x')\mathbb{1} - \gamma \bar{\rho}'_z(x)\chi_z(x')$. Observe also that the right eigenvector $\bar{\rho}'_z$ is the infinitesimal generator of the translations on $\mathcal{M}$.

We consider the random flow (2.1) with a initial condition lying in a $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$-neighborhood of $\mathcal{M}$. As fluctuations orthogonal to $\mathcal{M}$ are exponentially damped by the deterministic part of the flow, we deduce that the solution remains in such neighborhood until a large fluctuation takes place. For our purposes, those large fluctuations can be neglected, as they occur on time scales exponentially large in ε^{-1}. In particular, with very large probability, such solution to (2.1) remains in a $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$-neighborhood of $\mathcal{M}$ up to time scales of order ε^{-1}, which is the relevant one for the phase fluctuations.

In order to describe the motion along the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ we use the Fermi coordinates (ζ, ψ), defined as it follows. Given ρ in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{M}$, the angular coordinate $\zeta \in \mathbf{T}$, called the *center* of ρ, is defined as the point z such that the component of $\rho - \bar{\rho}_z$ in the null space of $\mathcal{L}_z$ vanishes, namely, the solution to

$$F(z) = \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x \, \chi_z \, (\rho - \bar{\rho}_z) = 0 \tag{2.11}$$

and then we set $\psi = \rho - \bar{\rho}_\zeta$, so that $\psi = \mathcal{P}_\zeta \psi$.

According to the scheme introduced in [9] and further developed in [8], the motion along the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ can be identified by the following recursive procedure. Given an initial datum $\rho(\cdot, 0)$ in a $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$-neighborhood of $\mathcal{M}$, we let ζ_0 be its center and decompose $\rho(\cdot, 0) = \bar{\rho}_{\zeta_0}(\cdot) + \psi(\cdot, 0)$. We then linearize the evolution (2.5) around $\bar{\rho}_{\zeta_0}$ and compute the displacement in a time interval $1 \ll T \ll \varepsilon^{-1}$. At this point, we recenter the solution by computing the new center ζ_T at time T and then iterate. As it will be clearer in the sequel, after $(\varepsilon T)^{-1}$ steps we get a finite displacement of the center, which has the form of a Brownian motion with a constant drift on $\mathbf{T}$. Dropping the subscript ζ_0 from the notation, we now detail the first step of such procedure. By introducing $u = u(x, t)$ as

$$u = \begin{pmatrix} u_A \\ u_B \end{pmatrix} = \rho - \bar{\rho},$$

the evolution (2.5) can be recast into the form,

$$u_t = \mathcal{L}u + \beta \mathcal{N}_1(u)_x + \sqrt{\varepsilon}\, \bar{\eta}^\varepsilon_x + \cdots , \tag{2.12}$$

where

$$\mathcal{N}_1(u) = \begin{pmatrix} u_A^2 + 2u_A u_B \\ -u_B^2 - 2u_A u_B \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.13}$$

$\mathcal{L}$ is as in (2.8)-(2.9), and we approximated η^ε with the Gaussian noise $\bar{\eta}^\varepsilon$, having covariance matrix $\Sigma(\bar{\rho}; x, x') = D(\bar{\rho}; x, x') + D(\bar{\rho}; x', x)$, with $D(\rho; x, x')$ as in (2.6).

By Duhamel formula,

$$u(t) = \mathrm{e}^{t\mathcal{L}}\psi(0) + \beta\int_0^t \mathrm{d}s\, \mathrm{e}^{(t-s)\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{N}_1(u(s))_x + \sqrt{\varepsilon}\, W^\varepsilon(t) + \cdots\,, \tag{2.14}$$

where $W^\varepsilon(t) = \begin{pmatrix} W_A^\varepsilon(t) \\ W_B^\varepsilon(t) \end{pmatrix}$ is Gaussian with covariance

$$\begin{aligned} &\big\langle W^\varepsilon(x,t)\, W^\varepsilon(x',t)^\top \big\rangle \\ &\quad = \int_0^t \mathrm{d}s \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}y \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}y' G_y(x,y,s)\delta_\varepsilon(y-y')\Sigma(\bar\rho;y,y')\, G_y(x',y',s)^\top \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

and $G(x,y,t) = \mathrm{e}^{t\mathcal{L}}(x,y)$ is the fundamental solution associated to $\mathcal{L}$.

Since $\psi(0)$ has vanishing projection on the null space of $\mathcal{L}$, i.e., $\mathcal{P}\psi(0) = \psi(0)$, the first term on the right hand side of (2.14) is exponentially small as $t \to \infty$. In particular, $u(T)$ is of order $\varepsilon^{\frac12}$ so that we can compute the displacement of the center in the time interval $[0,T]$ by solving (2.14) in the linear approximation. We thus get

$$\zeta_T = \zeta_0 - \gamma\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\, \chi(x)u(x,T) + \cdots\,, \tag{2.16}$$

where γ is defined in (2.10).

Computation of the variance and the drift. The variance of the infinitesimal displacement $\zeta_T - \zeta_0$ can be effectively computed by considering the component of the noise W^ε in the direction spanned by the right eigenvector $\bar\rho'$. Recalling (2.15) and that $\chi\, \mathrm{e}^{t\mathcal{L}} = \chi$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle(\zeta_T-\zeta_0)^2\rangle &\approx \varepsilon\gamma^2\Big\langle\Big(\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\, \chi(x)W^\varepsilon(x,T)\Big)^2\Big\rangle \approx \varepsilon T\gamma^2\int \mathrm{d}y\, \chi'(y)\Sigma(\bar\rho;y,y)\chi'(y)^\top \\ &= 2\varepsilon T\gamma^2\int \mathrm{d}y\, \big[\bar\rho_A(1-\bar\rho_A)(\bar\rho_B')^2 + 2\bar\rho_A\bar\rho_B\bar\rho_A'\bar\rho_B' + \bar\rho_B(1-\bar\rho_B)(\bar\rho_A')^2\big], \end{aligned}$$

where we evaluated (2.15) with δ_ε replaced by the true Dirac's δ-function. By translation invariance, each step of the iterations has the same variance. Therefore, since the fluctuation of the infinitesimal displacements relative to different steps are also independent and mean zero, they sum up to a Brownian motion with variance $\sigma^2 = \sigma^2(\beta,r)$ given by

$$\sigma^2 = 2\gamma^2\int \mathrm{d}y\, \big[\bar\rho_A(1-\bar\rho_A)(\bar\rho_B')^2 + 2\bar\rho_A\bar\rho_B\bar\rho_A'\bar\rho_B' + \bar\rho_B(1-\bar\rho_B)(\bar\rho_A')^2\big],$$

which has been computed in [5, Eq. (7)].

As discussed in the Introduction, the non-linear term contributes to the phase fluctuations at times ε^{-1}, by giving a constant drift to the resulting random motion. Our next aim is to identify this drift as a function of β and the total densities r_A, r_B.

As for the variance, we discuss in detail the contribution picked up in the first step of the iteration. Indeed, again by translation invariance, each step of the iterations gives the same contribution to the drift. Since u is of order $\varepsilon^{\frac12}$ and the non-linear term $\mathcal{N}_1$ in (2.13) is homogenous of degree two, the latter gives a contribution of order εT to the infinitesimal displacement $\zeta_T - \zeta_0$. Therefore, it sums up to a finite contribution at time-scale ε^{-1}.

Plugging (2.14) into (2.16) and taking expectation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \zeta_T \rangle &= \zeta_0 - \beta\,\gamma\,\varepsilon \int_0^T \mathrm{d}t \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\; \chi(x)\; \partial_x \left\langle \mathcal{N}_1(W^\varepsilon(x,t)) \right\rangle \\ &= \zeta_0 + \beta\,\gamma\,\varepsilon \int_0^T \mathrm{d}t \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\; \chi'(x)\; \left\langle \mathcal{N}_1(W^\varepsilon(x,t)) \right\rangle\,,\end{aligned}$$

where we used that χ is a left eigenvector of $\mathcal{L}$. By evaluating as before (2.15) with δ_ε replaced by the true Dirac's δ-function and recalling the form (2.13) of the nonlinearity,

$$\langle \zeta_T \rangle \approx \zeta_0 + \varepsilon T \beta\,\gamma\, \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathrm{d}t\; \int_0^t \mathrm{d}s\; \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\; \chi'(x) \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{K}_{AA}(x,s) + 2\mathcal{K}_{AB}(x,s) \\ -\mathcal{K}_{BB}(x,s) - 2\mathcal{K}_{AB}(x,s) \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\mathcal{K}(x,t) = \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}y\; G_y(x,y,t)\; \Sigma(\bar\rho; y,y)\; G_y(x,y,t)^\top. \tag{2.17}$$

The drift $v = v(\beta, r)$ is thus given by

$$v = \beta\gamma \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}t\; \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\; \chi'(x) \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{K}_{AA}(x,t) + 2\mathcal{K}_{AB}(x,t) \\ -\mathcal{K}_{BB}(x,t) - 2\mathcal{K}_{AB}(x,t) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.18}$$

3. BOUNDEDNESS OF THE DRIFT

The computations leading to the formula (2.18) for the drift have been carried out informally, pretending the limits we took did exist. In fact, by looking at (2.18), it is not at all obvious that the time integral on its right hand side is finite. Without discussing in detail the limiting procedure performed before, in this section we show that such time integral is meaningful. There are two potential problems: the singularity of the kernel $\mathcal{K}$ for $t \to 0$, which is the effect of the ultraviolet singularities mention before, and the convergence of the integral at infinity.

We start with the analysis of the singularity around the origin. For t small $G(x,y,t)$ behaves as the heat semigroup, i.e.,

$$G(x,y,t) = p_t(x-y) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{H}(x,y,t),$$

where

$$p_t(x-y) = \sum_{n\in\mathbf{Z}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi t}}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(x-y+n)^2}{4t}}$$

and $\mathcal{H}(x,y,t)$, $\mathcal{H}_y(x,y,t)$ are bounded as $t \to 0^+$. Therefore, by (2.17), the integrand on the right hand side of (2.18) should have the non integrable singularity $t^{-3/2}$ for t close to 0. As we next show, this divergence disappears due to a cancelation. We compute the (dangerous) contribution to the drift coming from the heat semigroup part of $G(x,y,t)$, i.e.,

$$v^{\mathrm{s}} = \beta\gamma \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}t\; \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\; \chi'(x) \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{K}^{\mathrm{s}}_{AA}(x,t) + 2\mathcal{K}^{\mathrm{s}}_{AB}(x,t) \\ -\mathcal{K}^{\mathrm{s}}_{BB}(x,t) - 2\mathcal{K}^{\mathrm{s}}_{AB}(x,t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

with

$$\mathcal{K}^{\mathrm{s}}(x,t) = \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}y\; [\partial_y p_t(x-y)]^2\; \Sigma(\bar\rho; y,y) = \frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}y\; g_t(x-y) \Sigma(\bar\rho; y,y),$$

where the even function

$$g_t(z) = \sum_{n,k\in\mathbf{Z}} \frac{(z+n)(z+k)}{4\pi t^{3/2}}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(z+k)^2+(z+n)^2}{4t}}$$

behaves like $(4\sqrt{\pi})^{-1}\delta(z)$ as $t \to 0^+$. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{K}^{\mathrm{s}}(x,t) = \frac{1}{t^{3/2}}\left[\frac{1}{4\sqrt{\pi}}\Sigma(\bar\rho;x,x) + O(t)\right],$$

so that

$$v^{\mathrm{s}} = \beta\gamma \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}t\, \frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\, \chi'(x)\ \left[\frac{1}{4\sqrt{\pi}}\begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{AA}(\bar\rho;x,x) + 2\Sigma_{AB}(\bar\rho;x,x) \\ -\Sigma_{BB}(\bar\rho;x,x) - 2\Sigma_{AB}(\bar\rho;x,x)\end{pmatrix} + O(t)\right].$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\, \chi'(x)\ \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{AA}(\bar\rho;x,x) + 2\Sigma_{AB}(\bar\rho;x,x) \\ -\Sigma_{BB}(\bar\rho;x,x) - 2\Sigma_{AB}(\bar\rho;x,x)\end{pmatrix} \\
&\quad = \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\, \bar\rho_B'[2\bar\rho_A(\bar\rho_A - 1) + 4\bar\rho_A\bar\rho_B] + \bar\rho_A'[2\bar\rho_B(\bar\rho_B - 1) + 4\bar\rho_A\bar\rho_B] \\
&\quad = 2\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}y\, (\bar\rho_A^2\bar\rho_B + \bar\rho_A\bar\rho_B^2 - \bar\rho_A\bar\rho_B)' = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e., the coefficient in front of the non integrable singularity $t^{-3/2}$ vanishes.

We now analyze the convergence of the integral (2.18) at infinity. We notice that, by our assumptions on the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}$,

$$G(x,y,t) = \gamma\, \bar\rho'(x)\, \chi(y) + \widehat{G}(x,y,t),$$

where the 2×2 rank one matrix $\gamma\, \bar\rho'(x)\, \chi(y)$ is the projection on the null space of $\mathcal{L}$, while the remainder $\widehat{G}(x,y,t)$ is exponentially small as $t\to\infty$. Therefore, plugging this decomposition in (2.17) we get,

$$\mathcal{K}(x,t) = \kappa\, \bar\rho'(x)\bar\rho'(x')^\top + R(x,x',t), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\kappa = \gamma^2\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}y\ \chi'(y)\Sigma(\bar\rho;y,y)\chi'(y)^\top$, while the remainder $R(x,x',t)$ is integrable at $t=\infty$.

By (2.13), inserting (3.1) in (2.18) and integrating by parts, we deduce that the drift v is finite provided that

$$\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\, \chi'\begin{pmatrix} (\bar\rho_A')^2 + 2\bar\rho_A'\bar\rho_B' \\ -(\bar\rho_B')^2 - 2\bar\rho_A'\bar\rho_B'\end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

As $\chi = (\bar\rho_B, -\bar\rho_A)$, the above conditions reads,

$$3\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\, \left[(\bar\rho_A')^2\bar\rho_B' + \bar\rho_A'(\bar\rho_B')^2\right] = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

To prove (3.2), we denote by I the integral on the left-hand side. Recalling that $\rho_C = 1 - \rho_A - \rho_B$ and integrating by parts, we then get

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= -3\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\, \bar\rho_A'\bar\rho_B'\bar\rho_C' = \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\, \left[\bar\rho_A(\bar\rho_B'\bar\rho_C')' + \bar\rho_B(\bar\rho_A'\bar\rho_C')' + \bar\rho_C(\bar\rho_A'\bar\rho_B')'\right] \\
&= \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\, \left[(\bar\rho_A\bar\rho_B)'\bar\rho_C'' + (\bar\rho_A\bar\rho_C)'\bar\rho_B'' + (\bar\rho_B\bar\rho_C)'\bar\rho_A''\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

On the other hand, (2.7) in term of the triple $(\bar\rho_A, \bar\rho_B, \bar\rho_C)$ reads,

$$\begin{cases} \bar\rho_A'' = -\beta[(\bar\rho_A\bar\rho_B)' - (\bar\rho_A\bar\rho_C)'], \\ \bar\rho_B'' = -\beta[(\bar\rho_B\bar\rho_C)' - (\bar\rho_B\bar\rho_A)'], \\ \bar\rho_C'' = -\beta[(\bar\rho_C\bar\rho_A)' - (\bar\rho_C\bar\rho_B)']. \end{cases}$$

Substituting the above relations in (3.3) the identity $I = 0$ follows.

4. Antisymmetry of the drift

In this section we show that, as thought by Bodineau and Derrida [5, § 6], the drift is antisymmetric with respect to the exchange of the species' labels. As a matter of fact, we present two independent arguments. The first relies on a direct analysis on the expression (2.18), while in the second we exploit a symmetry of the underlying microscopic dynamics.

Macroscopic computation. On the set of profiles $\rho = \begin{pmatrix}\rho_A \\ \rho_B\end{pmatrix}$ we introduce the involution Θ defined by

$$(\Theta\rho)(x) = \begin{pmatrix}\rho_B(-x) \\ \rho_A(-x)\end{pmatrix}.$$

In the language of high energy physics one may interpret Θ as a CP symmetry.

We then observe that if we include the dependence on the total densities r_A, r_B in the notation, the symmetry

$$\Theta\bar\rho(r_A, r_B) = \bar\rho(r_B, r_A)$$

holds modulo a translation on the torus (look at (2.7)).

Denoting by $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$ the linear operator defined as $\mathcal{L}$ but with the matrix function $\mathcal{B}$ replaced by

$$\Theta\mathcal{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 2(\Theta\bar\rho)_A + 2(\Theta\bar\rho)_B - 1 & 2(\Theta\bar\rho)_A \\ -2(\Theta\bar\rho)_B & -2(\Theta\bar\rho)_A - 2(\Theta\bar\rho)_B + 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.1}$$

it is easy to see that $\Theta \circ \mathcal{L} = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}} \circ \Theta$. This implies that if $\psi(x,t)$ is solution to $\partial_t\psi = \mathcal{L}\psi$ then $\widetilde\psi(x,t) = (\Theta\psi(\cdot,t))(x)$ is solution to $\partial_t\widetilde\psi = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}\widetilde\psi$. In particular,

$$G(x,y,t) = \begin{pmatrix}0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0\end{pmatrix} \widetilde G(-x,-y,t) \begin{pmatrix}0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0\end{pmatrix},$$

where $\widetilde G(x,y,t) = \mathrm{e}^{t\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}}(x,y)$ denotes the fundamental solution associated to $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$. On the other hand, recalling (2.6),

$$\widetilde\Sigma(\bar\rho; y, y) = \Sigma(\Theta\bar\rho; y, y) = \begin{pmatrix}0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0\end{pmatrix} \Sigma(\bar\rho; -y, -y) \begin{pmatrix}0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0\end{pmatrix},$$

whence, by (2.17),

$$\mathcal{K}(x,t) = \begin{pmatrix}0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0\end{pmatrix} \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}(-x,t) \begin{pmatrix}0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0\end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}(x,t) = \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}y\, \widetilde G_y(x,y,t)\, \widetilde\Sigma(\bar\rho; y, y)\, \widetilde G_y(x,y,t)^\top.$$

Therefore, by (2.18)

$$\begin{aligned} v &= \beta\gamma \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}t \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\, \chi'(x) \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{BB}(-x,t) + 2\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{AB}(-x,t) \\ -\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{AA}(-x,t) - 2\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{AB}(-x,t) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -\beta\gamma \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}t \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\, (\Theta\chi')(x) \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{AA}(x,t) + 2\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{AB}(x,t) \\ -\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{BB}(x,t) - 2\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{AB}(x,t) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -\beta\gamma \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}t \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\, \widetilde{\chi}'(x) \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{AA}(x,t) + 2\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{AB}(x,t) \\ -\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{BB}(x,t) - 2\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_{AB}(x,t) \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where $\widetilde{\chi} = (\Theta\bar\rho_B, -\Theta\bar\rho_A)$ is the left eigenvector of $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$ with zero eigenvalue and the identity $\widetilde{\chi}' = \Theta\chi'$ is straightforward. Recalling $\Theta\bar\rho(r_A, r_B) = \bar\rho(r_B, r_A)$ holds modulo a translation on the torus, by (4.2) we conclude that $v(r_A, r_B) = -v(r_B, r_A)$. Note indeed that by arguing as above (it is in fact easier) it holds $\gamma(r_A, r_B) = \gamma(r_B, r_A)$.

A microscopic symmetry. From a mathematical point of view, the ABC model is a continuous time Markov chain on the state space $\Omega = \{A, B, C\}^{\mathbf{Z}_L}$, where $\mathbf{Z}_L = \{0, \dots, L-1\}$ is the ring of the integers modulo L. Given $\zeta \in \Omega$, the species at site i is therefore $\zeta(i) \in \{A, B, C\}$. For $\beta \in \mathbf{R}$ the dynamical rules are specified by the generator $\mathbf{L}^\beta$ that acts on observables $f\colon \Omega \to \mathbf{R}$ as

$$\mathbf{L}^\beta f(\zeta) = \sum_{i \in \mathbf{Z}_L} c_i^\beta(\zeta)\big[f(\zeta^{i,i+1}) - f(\zeta)\big], \tag{4.3}$$

where $\zeta^{i,i+1}$ is the configuration obtained from ζ by exchanging the species at sites i and $i+1$ and the jump rates c_i^β are given by

$$c_i^\beta(\zeta) = \begin{cases} \exp\{\frac{\beta}{2L}\} & \text{if } (\zeta(i), \zeta(i+1)) \in \{(A,C), (C,B), (B,A)\}, \\ \exp\{-\frac{\beta}{2L}\} & \text{if } (\zeta(i), \zeta(i+1)) \in \{(A,B), (B,C), (C,A)\}. \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

We next prove a symmetry property of the microscopic stochastic dynamics with respect to a suitable involution defined on the state space Ω. The antisymmetry of the macroscopic drift will be then shown to be a consequence of such symmetry. Let τ be a transposition of the species' labels and denote by $\tau\alpha \in \{A, B, C\}$ the image of $\alpha \in \{A, B, C\}$. We associate to each τ the involution $\Theta_\tau\colon \Omega \to \Omega$ defined by

$$\Theta_\tau \zeta(i) = \tau\zeta(-i),$$

which induces a natural transformation on observables $f\colon \Omega \to \mathbf{R}$ by setting $\Theta_\tau f(\zeta) = f(\Theta_\tau\zeta)$. We claim that the microscopic dynamics satisfies,

$$\Theta_\tau \circ \mathbf{L}^{-\beta} = \mathbf{L}^\beta \circ \Theta_\tau. \tag{4.5}$$

To prove the relationship (4.5), observe that $(\alpha, \alpha') \in \{(A,C), (C,B), (B,A)\}$ if and only if $(\tau\alpha, \tau\alpha') \in \{(A,B), (B,C), (C,A)\}$. Whence, by (4.4),

$$c_i^{-\beta}(\Theta_\tau\zeta) = c_{-(i+1)}^\beta(\zeta).$$

Recalling (4.3) we deduce,

$$\Theta_\tau \circ \mathbf{L}^{-\beta} f(\zeta) = \sum_{i \in \mathbf{Z}_L} c_{-(i+1)}^\beta(\zeta)\big[f((\Theta_\tau\zeta)^{i,i+1}) - f(\Theta_\tau\zeta)\big].$$

Therefore, as $(\Theta_\tau\zeta)^{i,i+1} = \Theta_\tau\zeta^{-(i+1),-i}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_\tau \circ \mathbf{L}^{-\beta} f(\zeta) &= \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}_L} c^\beta_{-(i+1)}(\zeta)\big[f(\Theta_\tau\zeta^{-(i+1),-i}) - f(\Theta_\tau\zeta)\big]\\ &= \sum_{j\in\mathbf{Z}_L} c^\beta_j(\zeta)\big[f(\Theta_\tau\zeta^{j,j+1}) - f(\Theta_\tau\zeta)\big]\\ &= \mathbf{L}^\beta \circ \Theta_\tau f(\zeta).\end{aligned}$$

The relationship (4.5) implies the corresponding symmetry on the statistics of the paths of the ABC model. In particular, if the process has a macroscopic drift $v = v(\beta; r_A, r_B, r_C)$ then it necessarily satisfies $v(\beta; r_A, r_B, r_C) = v(-\beta; r_{\tau A}, r_{\tau B}, r_{\tau C})$. The antisymmetry of the drift with respect to the transposition of the species' labels now holds provided v is an odd function of β. Recalling that v is given by the expression (2.18), this can be directly verified.

Appendix A. Nonexistence of traveling waves

In this appendix we prove the nonexistence of traveling wave solutions to the system (1.1) that satisfy the constraint $\rho_A + \rho_B + \rho_C = 1$. Denoting by c its speed, such a wave is a function of the form

$$\rho(x,t) = \begin{pmatrix} Y_A(x-ct) \\ Y_B(x-ct) \\ 1 - Y_A(x-ct) - Y_B(x-ct)\end{pmatrix}$$

where $Y = (Y_A, Y_B)^\top$ is a noncostant one-periodic solution to

$$-\,c\,Y' = Y'' + \beta\,\mathcal{N}(Y)', \tag{A.1}$$

where $\mathcal{N}(\cdot)$ is defined in (2.4). By integration, it follows that Y solves the first order planar system

$$Y' = F_K(Y),$$

where $F_K(Y) = K - cY - \beta\mathcal{N}(Y)$ for some constant vector $K = (K_A, K_B)^\top$. Since $\mathrm{div}F_K(y) = -2c$, the Bendixson's criterium, see, e.g., [19, § II.4.67], implies that for $c \neq 0$ the above planar system does not admit periodic (in particular one-periodic), non-stationary solutions. Indeed, assume by contradiction that such solution exists, denote by Λ the bounded region delimited by its orbit, and let $\widehat{n}$ be the outer normal to Λ. By the Gauss-Ostrogradskij's formula, $\int_\Lambda \mathrm{div}F_K = \oint_{\partial\Lambda} F_K\cdot\widehat{n} = 0$ since $F_K \perp \widehat{n}$ on $\partial\Lambda$. This yields the desired contradiction for $c \neq 0$.

Appendix B. Howto guess fluctuating hydrodynamics

We here briefly discuss, without even attempting any mathematical justification, how the fluctuating hydrodynamics (2.1)–(2.3) can be inferred from the underlying microscopic Markovian dynamics. We refer to [5, 6, 10] for a somewhat alternative argument.

Recalling the notation for the ABC dynamics introduced in Section 4, the occupation numbers of the species are given by $\sigma_\alpha(i) = 1\!\!1_\alpha(\zeta(i))$, $\alpha \in \{A, B, C\}$, $i \in \mathbf{Z}_L$. From these variables we construct the empirical densities of the species as

$$\pi_\alpha = \frac{1}{L}\sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}_L} \sigma_\alpha(i)\delta_{i/L}, \qquad \alpha \in \{A, B, C\},$$

that we regard as a random measure on the unit torus $\mathbf{T}$.

To infer the evolution of the empirical densities, we recall that if $f\colon \Omega \to \mathbf{R}$ is an observable then, as follows from the theory of Markov chains, its expected infinitesimal increment is $\mathbf{L}^\beta f$, i.e., conditionally on $\zeta(t)$ it holds

$$\big\langle f(\zeta(t+\mathrm{d}t)) - f(\zeta(t))\big\rangle = \mathbf{L}^\beta f(\zeta(t))\mathrm{d}t + o(\mathrm{d}t).$$

In order to perform this computation for the empirical densities it is convenient to introduce smooth test functions $J_\alpha\colon \mathbf{T} \to \mathbf{R}$. By setting

$$\langle \pi_\alpha, J_\alpha\rangle = \frac{1}{L}\sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}_L} J_\alpha\big(\tfrac{i}{L}\big)\sigma_\alpha(i),$$

simple computations then show,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{L}^\beta\langle \pi_\alpha, J_\alpha\rangle = \frac{1}{L}\sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}_L}\big[J_\alpha\big(\tfrac{i+1}{L}\big) - J_\alpha\big(\tfrac{i}{L}\big)\big]\big\{&\sigma_\alpha(i)[\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\beta}{2L}}\sigma_{\alpha+1}(i+1) + \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\beta}{2L}}\sigma_{\alpha+2}(i+1)]\\ &- [\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\beta}{2L}}\sigma_{\alpha+1}(i) + \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\beta}{2L}}\sigma_{\alpha+2}(i)]\sigma_\alpha(i+1)\big\},\end{aligned}$$

where the summation in the species labels α is modulo three. By approximating discrete gradients with continuous derivatives, expanding the exponential, and summing by parts, we then obtain

$$\mathbf{L}^\beta\langle \pi_\alpha, J_\alpha\rangle \approx \frac{1}{L^2}\frac{1}{L}\sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}_L}\big\{J_\alpha''\big(\tfrac{i}{L}\big)\sigma_{\alpha+1}(i) - \beta\, J_\alpha'\big(\tfrac{i}{L}\big)\sigma_\alpha(i)\big[\sigma_{\alpha+1}(i+1) - \sigma_{\alpha+2}(i+1)\big]\big\}.$$

Provided that we could replace the local product $\sigma_\alpha(i)\sigma_{\alpha'}(i+1)$ above with the corresponding product of the local densities, we then identify the drift term in the fluctuating hydrodynamic equation (2.1). While this factorization hypotheses has been widely used, see e.g., [6], we mention that it could be rigorously justified by the methods of the hydrodynamical limits. More precisely, if we consider an initial configuration of the species that is associated to some density profile $\rho(0) = (\rho_A(0), \rho_B(0), \rho_C(0))$ then the empirical densities at times $O(L^2)$ converges as $L \to \infty$ to the solution of the hydrodynamic equation (1.1) with initial datum $\rho(0)$. The proof of such a statement should be achieved by using standard tools in hydrodynamical limits, see e.g., [18, 21], however, to our knowledge, the actual details for the ABC model have not been carried out. We emphasize that in order to justify the use of the fluctuating hydrodynamics for the computation of the drift of phase fluctuations, we would need the validity of the factorization assumption up to times $O(L^3)$, certainly a most challenging issue in the context of hydrodynamical limits.

To identify the fluctuations of the empirical densities, we recall that, according to the general theory of Markov chains, if $f, g\colon \Omega \to \mathbf{R}$ are two observables then, conditionally on $\zeta(t)$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big\langle \big[f(\zeta(t+\mathrm{d}t)) - f(\zeta(t)) - \mathbf{L}^\beta f(\zeta(t))\mathrm{d}t\big]\cdot\big[g(\zeta(t+\mathrm{d}t)) - g(\zeta(t)) - \mathbf{L}^\beta g(\zeta(t))\mathrm{d}t\big]\Big\rangle\\ &\quad = \big[\mathbf{L}^\beta fg\,(\zeta(t)) - f(\zeta(t))\,\mathbf{L}^\beta g(\zeta(t)) - g(\zeta(t))\,\mathbf{L}^\beta f(\zeta(t))\big]\,\mathrm{d}t + o(\mathrm{d}t).\end{aligned}$$

The fluctuations of the empirical densities π_α are therefore characterized by the quadratic form,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\alpha,\alpha'}(J_\alpha, J_{\alpha'}) &= \mathbf{L}^\beta\big[\langle\pi_\alpha, J_\alpha\rangle\langle\pi_{\alpha'}, J_{\alpha'}\rangle\big]\\ &\quad - \langle\pi_\alpha, J_\alpha\rangle\mathbf{L}^\beta\langle\pi_{\alpha'}, J_{\alpha'}\rangle - \langle\pi_{\alpha'}, J_{\alpha'}\rangle\mathbf{L}^\beta\langle\pi_\alpha, J_\alpha\rangle\end{aligned}\qquad \alpha, \alpha' \in \{A, B, C\},$$

where as before $J_\alpha : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbf{R}$ are smooth test functions. By straightforward computations, for $\alpha' = \alpha$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{\alpha,\alpha}(J_\alpha, J_\alpha) &= \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}_L} \big[J_\alpha\big(\tfrac{i+1}{L}\big) - J_\alpha\big(\tfrac{i}{L}\big)\big]^2 \big\{\sigma_\alpha(i)\big[\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\beta}{2L}}\sigma_{\alpha+1}(i+1) \\
&\qquad + \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\beta}{2L}}\sigma_{\alpha+2}(i+1)\big] + \big[\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\beta}{2L}}\sigma_{\alpha+1}(i) + \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\beta}{2L}}\sigma_{\alpha+2}(i)\big]\sigma_\alpha(i+1)\big\} \\
&\approx \frac{1}{L^2}\frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}_L} J'_\alpha\big(\tfrac{i}{L}\big)^2 \\
&\qquad \times \big\{\sigma_\alpha(i)\big[\sigma_{\alpha+1}(i+1) + \sigma_{\alpha+2}(i+1)\big] + \big[\sigma_{\alpha+1}(i) + \sigma_{\alpha+2}(i)\big]\sigma_\alpha(i+1)\big\},
\end{aligned}$$

while, for $\alpha' = \alpha + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{\alpha,\alpha+1}(J_\alpha, J_{\alpha+1}) &= -\frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}_L} \big[J_\alpha\big(\tfrac{i+1}{L}\big) - J_\alpha\big(\tfrac{i}{L}\big)\big]\big[J_{\alpha+1}\big(\tfrac{i+1}{L}\big) - J_{\alpha+1}\big(\tfrac{i}{L}\big)\big] \\
&\quad \times \big\{\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\beta}{2L}}\sigma_\alpha(i)\sigma_{\alpha+1}(i+1) + \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\beta}{2L}}\sigma_{\alpha+1}(i)\sigma_\alpha(i+1)\big\} \\
&\approx -\frac{1}{L^2}\frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}_L} J'_\alpha\big(\tfrac{i}{L}\big) J'_{\alpha+1}\big(\tfrac{i}{L}\big)\big\{\sigma_\alpha(i)\sigma_{\alpha+1}(i+1) + \sigma_{\alpha+1}(i)\sigma_\alpha(i+1)\big\},
\end{aligned}$$

and finally, for $\alpha' = \alpha + 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{\alpha,\alpha+2}(J_\alpha, J_{\alpha+2}) &= -\frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}_L} \big[J_\alpha\big(\tfrac{i+1}{L}\big) - J_\alpha\big(\tfrac{i}{L}\big)\big]\big[J_{\alpha+2}\big(\tfrac{i+1}{L}\big) - J_{\alpha+2}\big(\tfrac{i}{L}\big)\big] \\
&\quad \times \big\{\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\beta}{2L}}\sigma_\alpha(i)\sigma_{\alpha+2}(i+1) + \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\beta}{2L}}\sigma_{\alpha+2}(i)\sigma_\alpha(i+1)\big\} \\
&\approx -\frac{1}{L^2}\frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}_L} J'_\alpha\big(\tfrac{i}{L}\big) J'_{\alpha+2}\big(\tfrac{i}{L}\big)\big\{\sigma_\alpha(i)\sigma_{\alpha+2}(i+1) + \sigma_{\alpha+2}(i)\sigma_\alpha(i+1)\big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

In view of the factorization assumption discussed before, the fluctuations of the empirical densities agree with the correlation of the noise in (2.1). Compare in particular (2.2) and (2.3) to the above expressions.

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to T. Bodineau, B. Derrida, and C. Mascia for useful exchanges of views.

References

[1] Ayyer A., Carlen E.A., Lebowitz J.L., Mohanty P.K., Mukamel D., Speer E.R.: *Phase diagram of the ABC model on an interval.* J. Stat. Phys. **137**, 1166–1204 (2009).

[2] Bertini, L., Cancrini N., Posta G.: *On the dynamical behavior of the ABC model.* J. Stat. Phys. **144**, 1284–1307. (2011).

[3] Bertini, L., G. Giacomin, G.: *Stochastic Burgers and KPZ equations from particle systems.* Commun. Math. Phys. **183**, 571-607 (1997).

[4] Bertini, L., G. Giacomin, G., Poquet, C.: *Synchronization and random long time dynamics for mean-field plane rotators.* Preprint 2012. `arXiv:1209.4537`

[5] Bodineau, T., Derrida, B.: *Phase fluctuations in the ABC model.* J. Stat. Phys. **145**, 745–762 (2011).

[6] Bodineau T., Derrida B., Lecomte V., van Wijland F.: *Long range correlations and phase transitions in Non-equilibrium diffusive systems.* J. Stat. Phys. **133**, 1013–1031 (2008).

[7] Brassesco, S., Buttà, P.: *Interface fluctuations for the D=1 stochastic Ginzburg-Landau equation with non-symmetric reaction term.* J. Stat. Phys. **93**, 1111–1142 (1998).

[8] Brassesco, S., Buttà, P., De Masi, A., Presutti, E.: *Interface fluctuations and couplings in the $d = 1$ Ginzburg–Landau equation with noise.* J. Theoret. Probab. **11**, 25–80 (1998).

[9] Brassesco, S., De Masi, A., Presutti, E.: *Brownian fluctuations of the interface in the* $d = 1$ *Ginzburg–Landau equation with noise.* Annal. Inst. H. Poincaré **31**, 81–118 (1995).
[10] Clincy M., Derrida B., Evans M.R.: *Phase transition in the ABC model.* Phys. Rev. E **67**, 066115 (2003).
[11] Cohen O., Mukamel D.: *Phase diagram of the ABC model with nonequal densities.* J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **44** 415004 (2011).
[12] Evans M.R., Kafri Y., Koduvely H.M., Mukamel D.: *Phase separation in one-dimensional driven diffusive systems.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 425–429 (1998).
[13] Evans M.R., Kafri Y., Koduvely H.M., Mukamel D.: *Phase separation and coarsening in one-dimensional driven diffusive systems: Local dynamics leading to long-range Hamiltonians.* Phys. Rev. E **58**, 2764–2778 (1998).
[14] Fayolle G., Furtlehner C.: *Stochastic deformations of sample paths of random walks and exclusion models.* Mathematics and computer science. III, 415–428, Trends Math., Birkhäuser, Basel, 2004.
[15] Fayolle G., Furtlehner C.: *Stochastic dynamics of discrete curves and multi-type exclusion processes.* J. Stat. Phys. **127**, 1049–1094 (2007).
[16] Funaki, T.: *The scaling limit for a stochastic PDE and the separation of phases.* Prob. Theory Relat. Fields **102**, 221–288 (1995).
[17] Hairer M.: *Solving the KPZ equation.* Ann. of Math. (to appear).
[18] Kipnis C., Landim C.: *Scaling limits of interacting particle systems.* Springer, Berlin, 1999.
[19] Nemytskii, V.V., Stepanov, V.V.: *Qualitative theory of differential equations.* Dover, New York 1989.
[20] Quartullo, D.: *Studio delle equazioni idrodinamiche del modello ABC.* Graduate thesis, Sapienza Università di Roma, 2012.
[21] Spohn H.: *Large scale dynamics of interacting particles.* Springer, Berlin, 1991.

Lorenzo Bertini
Dipartimento di Matematica, Sapienza Università di Roma
P.le Aldo Moro 5, 00185 Roma, Italy
E-mail address: `bertini@mat.uniroma1.it`

Paolo Buttà
Dipartimento di Matematica, Sapienza Università di Roma
P.le Aldo Moro 5, 00185 Roma, Italy
E-mail address: `butta@mat.uniroma1.it`